

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
MARCH 8, 2006**

**CALL TO
ORDER**

A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Board members present were Charles Lapp, Don Hines, Jeff Larsen, Gene Dziza, Kathy Robertson, Gordon Cross, Randy Toavs, and Kim Fleming. Frank DeKort had an excused absence. Kirsten Holland and Jeff Harris represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were approximately 80 people in the audience.

**PUBLIC
REVIEW**

Jeff Larsen reviewed the public hearing process for the public. He stated he would be stepping down for item #1 and item #3 on the agenda. He turned the meeting over to the vice chairman, Gene Dziza.

**MASTER PLAN
AMENDMENT/
RIVERDALE**

A request to amend the 1987 Flathead County Master Plan to include the Riverdale Neighborhood Plan. The properties are located north of Kalispell, west of US Highway 93 North and contain approximately 3800 acres.

STAFF REPORT

Jeff Harris reviewed Staff Report FPMA 05-07 for the Board. He stated he had revised the report after the West Valley Land Use Advisory Committee to reflect their recommendation, and handed an amended report to the Board members.

APPLICANT

Johna Morrison, of Schwarz Architecture and Engineering, read a statement from the landowners involved in the plan area, stating the process they have been through over the last 11 months. The plan grew from 11 landowners to 38 landowners who wished to take the process into their own hands and create a vision of what they wanted for the Riverdale area. They revised the plan several times before it was accepted by FCPZ staff. Morrison stated the landowners and engineers held several public meetings, and offered her personal view as to how the Plan was revised and how it complies with what the Planning Department recommended for a neighborhood plan. Morrison pointed out on the map, the boundaries of the Plan and addressed how the boundaries were chosen. She pointed out the boundaries, roads, and other features of the Plan.

John Schwarz, of Schwarz Architecture and Engineering, gave his perspective of what he felt the people wanted for this area. He stated the decision tonight is what the people want for the quality of life in this area. He addressed what he felt would be most productive for everyone tonight. In his opinion, he feels local transportation systems need to consider pedestrian movement. He feels very strong about pedestrian movement being a greater part of our society. We have unique community assets that must be valued to planning. We have a certain quality of life that exists and therefore must be protected. Planning is a tool and we need to use it wisely. He believes the neighbors have put together a plan that keeps things moving and preserves the values, which are fundamental to the community. He spoke about transportation corridors based on the size of a community. He also spoke about how the neighbors presented a grid system that is close to a major arterial. He commented on water and sewer for this plan area, and anticipates the City of Kalispell will eventually provide services to this area. He stated the applicants provided a 'back-up plan' with a tertiary system for the

highest density and a level two treatment system for the remainder. They anticipate the city will provide water systems for the area as well, but as an alternative plan they propose a placement of public water systems. He spoke about open space and stated he is an advocate of open space standards. The applicants want to develop to a standard that preserves the value the community likes most.

The Board asked for clarification on the open space in regards to the density of the proposal.

Schwarz explained the long term aspect of permanent open space that will be placed in perpetuity, referred to as permanent common open space. He stated this is not a private space only for the homeowners. The concept of this plan, he states, is to encourage those uses that would set up permanent open space standards. He commented the neighbors want to see this plan implemented.

Ken Kalvig, of Scott and Kalvig, said the Riverdale Neighborhood Plan, in his opinion, represents community planning about as good as you can get a community planning document. He asked the Board to give the applicants the opportunity tonight, while they are all here, to address all the issues and concerns so this process can move forward. He has gone to many workshops and provided input in developing neighborhood plans, and said this is about as landowner and neighbor oriented as you can get. He stated the owners of these parcels of land are concerned about the future, and they worked very hard come up with this neighborhood plan. He read a section of the Flathead County Growth Policy talking about neighborhood plans. He commented the Riverdale plan is consistent with the overall planning document; the current Master Plan. He also stated when the new Growth Policy is adopted this plan will have to be reviewed to be sure it is compliant with that policy. He helped write the Riverdale Neighborhood Plan, and said they listened to the Planning Board in regards to their concerns when the Two Rivers Master Plan went before the Planning Board. The Board's concerns were taken into account when this Riverdale Plan was being written. He stated they had numerous meetings with the Planning Staff to come up with this current plan. He showed the Board the original map that was submitted for this plan and stated the Planning Staff requested they make the area larger to include the parcels that would make this plan a contiguous plan area. He stated the applicants do not have any problems with the conditions stated in the staff report. They will work with the Planning Staff to make this a better plan.

Kalvig handed a packet to the Board members.

He stated because of the various re-writes of the text of this plan they had a couple of things that ended up in the final draft that were not intended and he wanted to point those out. The design guidelines that were in the original plan are to be deleted from the plan as they are no longer a part of the plan. He said the Planning Staff wanted a more general guideline so the applicants removed the detailed guidelines from the neighborhood plan. The second change was a "typo" on page 21 that should be struck from the plan. A reference to the Montana Agricultural Protection Act was misplaced and it should not be referenced at all. He stated those are two minimal changes that should be adopted as part of this.

He handed the Board an email notice that was distributed by Citizens for a Better Flathead and stated he wasn't going to criticize anyone's efforts to get public participation in this process, if this is how it has to be done then so be it. He wanted to point out the Board would see reference and guidance from Citizens for a Better Flathead. All people had to do was cut and paste the bullet points that had been put in this literature as their public comment.

He reiterated the process the people involved with this plan have gone through, and feels they have been very thoughtful and responsible with what they have done. He feels the material speaks for itself and chose not to go through some of the points and address or perhaps rebut some of them. He believes the points and counterpoints speak for themselves to anybody that has read the plan.

AGENCIES

Dave Prunty of the Flathead County Solid Waste District read a letter drafted by his Board of Directors. He wanted to read it for the record. (Letter in file)

Bob Horne of the Whitefish Planning Department was asked by the City Council and the City manager to come and speak on their behalf. He stated Whitefish is also working on their own Growth Policy and they all feel there is no reason to entertain a Master Plan of this magnitude before the Growth Policy is adopted. They have many concerns and are requesting many impact studies prior to adopting this plan. They are asking for this plan to be tabled or denied until the adoption of the Flathead County Growth Policy.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Parker, 6495 Farm to Market Road, co-owner of Majestic Valley Arena, feels this plan takes into consideration the County's need for its neighbors and longtime residents to participate in the future of the Valley. He said the members of this plan are hardworking citizens who have come together to formulate this plan and have spent 13 months putting it together and believe this is a solid step towards growth.

George Taylor, 504 5th Avenue East, wanted the Board to consider meeting with the City Planning Board before approving this plan. He is a strong advocate of having a sewer line go all the way up Highway 93 to these properties, and go all the way to Somers to accommodate any projects we will have there. He wants to do this together in a positive manner and thoughtful, planned, manner. He thinks this is a good plan that needs some details worked out.

John Hinchey, 534 4th Avenue East in Kalispell, serves on the City Planning Board and wants to emphasize the City Planning Board would like the opportunity to work with the County Planning Board on this plan. He spoke about the joint work session with the two Boards and hoped they would table this proposal until that time.

Hank Galpin, 1885 Stillwater Road, is a principle landowner in the Riverdale Plan. He said agriculture is in a state of transition and hasn't made any money in years. The family is liquidating assets to help keep the farm together, but he feels there will be a time when this will change and he feels they need to plan for their future.

Mary Critchlow, 520 4th Avenue East in Kalispell, wants to preserve the recreational opportunities in the Valley. She doesn't see specific details in the plan for this and sees vague inconsistencies as to how it will be laid out and would like to see a detailed

map as to what would go in there.

Scott Wheeler, 1110 Baldrock Road, wants the Board to not set a precedent with the removal of 850 acres from one neighborhood plan to another.

Bob Lopp, 52 West View Drive, has firmly supported neighborhood plans in the past but feels the commercial area has a very high water table and is concerned. He doesn't see a lot of infrastructure although there is parkland. He would like to make sure there will be public access to the river corridor. He also does not want the public to be able to protest the annexation into the city. Many people were not aware of this plan, and he feels the Board needs to allow the public time to adjust to this proposal and for people to be able to see the plan in its entirety. He wants the applicants to wait until the new Growth Policy is adopted before passing this proposal on.

Suzanne Brown, 1535 Foy's Lake Road, feels the valley is already overwhelmed with development. She stated there is already too much traffic and commercial development. She feels we need to save farm land, open space, etc...for the future.

Colleen Frizzell, 221 West 4th Street in Whitefish (employed at Majestic Valley Arena), feels the neighborhood plan allows people to afford homes. She thinks people need to decide for themselves; the world is not made by architects but by the people.

George Ingham, 805 Spring Prairie Road in Whitefish, has 120 acres of land incorporated in this proposal but is not a member of this project. He feels we need to keep the open space and use careful planning; this is strip and sprawl. He wants the Board to table this plan, think about where development needs to go, and look at it carefully.

Howard Mann, 3154 Parkwood Lane, recently purchased property in this plan. He feels people will move here regardless, and we need to design projects governed by supply and demand. He asked the Board to support this proposal.

BJ Carlson, 2620 Mission Trail Way, feels this is a place to live and a place to see. She feels this is a "quality of life" decision. She stated there has been a lot of public involvement with the new Growth Policy being drafted and the timing of this plan is not advisable. She stated we have 20,000 lots available for development at this time, and feels we do not need this plan, at this time, for development. It makes a lot of sense to finish the Growth Policy before making an irreversible decision. She wants an inventory of the commercial development we currently have. The view shed is gone between Flathead Valley Community College and Reserve Drive. There are win/win solutions; Friends for Development Rights, Conservation Easements and the purchase of development rights. Farmers do need exit plans, but there are realistic solutions that benefit farmers and the community at large. She wants a community she can be proud of.

Jolene Sipe, 1377 Whitefish Stage (a Majestic Valley Arena employee), feels the farmers have the right to develop their land in order to provide a living for themselves and their families. She supported approval of this plan to allow these homesteaders to provide for their families. The farmers have paid their dues and they know how to manage their property.

Jan Glen, 3630 Highway 93 (co-owner of Majestic Valley Arena), said they are pleased to be part of the Riverdale plan. She stated the applicants have put a tremendous amount of time and effort, with expert guidance from the Planning Office, to come up with an end result that exemplifies smart growth. She feels the owners need to be given the right to do what they want with their land, within reason, and she believes this is a fabulous plan.

Bruce Tutvedt, 2335 West Valley Drive, lives and farms the south and west side of this plan. It gives the landowners the flexibility to develop their land as they need. They have put a lot of time and effort into this plan and he feels it is a very good plan. He feels the Board should go forward with this plan, which would in turn help the people who are doing this right.

Larry Gibbel, Chief operation officer at Majestic Valley Arena, feels the arena is indirectly related to this plan. He spoke about how the Arena has impacted the area and what it represents. He feels the arena's goal is to be of service to the community and feels this neighborhood plan is trying to do the same.

Rebecca Durham, 251 Elk Trail in Whitefish, is concerned with rapid development promoting sprawl and a low quality of life; she would like more careful planning. She feels there is ample opportunity for housing and wanted the Board to wait on this proposal.

Clare la Chappell, 3580 Farm to Market Road, questioned a parcel of land and wanted the board to be aware of the nitrates in the well in this area. She wants the Board to look into Lost Creek. She feels there is a contaminated water source near this area and would like the Board to take this into consideration.

Kip Willis, 445 Lost Creek Lane (West Valley), is concerned about the scale of this project and traffic. He feels there will have to be an addition to the new school currently being built as well as additions to the smaller school in the area. The road conditions are also of concern.

Greg Stevens, 31 Lower Valley Road, has been involved in writing, reviewing, and re-writing Master Plans, Master Plan Amendments, and Neighborhood Plans and he understands the difficulty. This neighborhood plan is the best he has seen in 10 yrs. The language and concepts are as comprehensive as possible. He commended the Planning Staff for their input. He feels the uses are defined and appropriate for future use. He feels the people have done a real service to this Board. In his opinion, he feels it was well thought out and very appropriate. He wanted the Board to forward a favorable recommendation.

Ward McCartney, 7227 Farm to Market Road, feels this is the largest development, not a neighborhood plan, he has ever seen. He is frustrated about the meeting place; he couldn't see or hear the presentation. He feels this is a "leap frog" development; too far into the future. The services are not out that far yet and he feels it is inappropriate. Creating more lots does not create affordability. He stated the Master Plan was a very good plan that is now outdated. He feels it is up to the Board to make a good plan of this area.

Pierre Kaptanian, 201 First Avenue East in Kalispell, is in favor of this proposal. He feels the property owners should be able to develop their property how they want.

Mark Schwagger, 2226 West Valley Drive, voted against having 850 acres taken out of the West Valley Neighborhood Plan. He feels there are too many unanswered questions with this proposal. Traffic is a concern for him, he feels this plan is too soon, and he wants the Growth Policy to be adopted before moving forward with this proposal.

Emy Amy, 145 Trumball Meadows Lane, wants to preserve the quality of life in Montana; she has pleaded with this Board and the County Commissioners for this. She feels the farmers have the right to do what they want with their property, but not to go in together to create a huge subdivision; this plan is premature. She wants the Growth Policy to be adopted before this plan moves forward. She would like the Board to table it and use the guidelines coming forth in the new Growth Policy.

Dale Newman, 169 Trail Ridge Road, is discouraged with all the Master Plan Amendments. He feels this is “leap-frogging” and wants to keep this area agricultural in nature. He disagrees with the Staff Report and the plan as it seems out of scale for the area.

Ginny Coyle, 120 Marvins Way, is opposed to this plan. She feels this is an “exit strategy” for some located in the West Valley Neighborhood Plan. She is concerned about the development that borders the West Valley neighborhood.

Sharon DeMeester, 418 Chestnut Drive, pointed out particular properties that were never informed of this plan. She feels Citizens for a Better Flathead is trying to inform the public of what is going on in the community.

Linda Johnson, 2615 Helena Flats Road, thinks this is massive and is a development not a neighborhood plan. She feels it will have huge impacts on traffic and safety. She would like the Board to wait for the Growth Policy to be adopted so it can be done right.

Diane Yarus, 425 Ponderosa Lane, feels this will have a huge impact on the valley. She is concerned with traffic and would like traffic studies.

Jim Morino, 1555 Church Drive, feels the plan is premature. We need to mandate policies on existing developments. Traffic studies should be done and road standards need to be improved prior to any construction to the development. He is concerned about negative impacts on public safety. He feels the Board needs to consider all of the concerns.

Judy Auswitz, 6505 Farm to Market Road, is a farmer who wants to keep her land in agricultural use. She feels subdivisions are named for what is lost in that area. She referenced Lost Farm Road and Golden View Subdivision, which used to be a barley field. She stated home sites use more toxic chemicals than farming. She spoke about the open space proposed in this plan. She feels this plan should not be on the agenda until after the new Growth Policy is adopted.

Laura Miller, Columbia Falls Stage Road, is concerned about the location of this neighborhood plan. Her main concern is that the cities will all be joined together one day and nothing spectacular will stand out in this area; it will be “anywhere America”. She had been in the Planning Office, a month prior, to discuss putting together a neighborhood plan in her area and was told by the Planning Director they would not be looking at neighborhood plans until the new Growth Policy was adopted.

Gary Krueger, 805 Church Drive, stated he was not originally part of this neighborhood plan, but was asked by the Planning Director to join in. He feels this plan is good. He stated he would like to continue farming until he no longer can. He also stated his children have made it perfectly clear they do not want to farm. He commented about how he can develop his land.

Larry Linne, from Kila, told the Board they do not need to address water, sewer or transportation issues at this time; this is not the time for that kind of review. He stated Highway 93 will be a four lane highway and there will be an underpass at Church Drive. He asked the Board to give these people respect and not table this plan. He stated these people have been working a very long time on this plan and reiterated they are not newcomers to the Valley. He asked the Board to not sweep this under the rug and table it forever; they deserve better than that. He said if the Board needs a week or a month to review the information they received it is totally understandable.

Herb Koenig, 430 Church Drive, has property within the Riverdale Plan. He feels the landowners have the right to do what they want with their land. They cooperated as a group to put this plan together. He spoke about the changes to the Valley since he has lived here and wished people would see it from the landowner’s point-of-view.

Brian Sipe, 1377 Whitefish Stage, said the people involved with this plan deserve a vote tonight and not the decision to table it; to table this proposal would be a coward’s way out. The people involved in this plan have paid their dues and taxes and have put their children through school. He feels the vast majority of people who spoke against this plan do not even live in this district and the vast majority of the people who live in the district are for the plan.

Matt W., 251 Elk Trail (Happy Valley), feels the landowners have put a great deal of time into this plan but the public should have more time to comment on it.

Mayre Flowers, 35 4th Street, handed out the Powerpoint presentation, previously submitted at the Two Rivers Development Plan, and also the action alert sent to citizens. She feels this plan does not provide the detail the citizens want in this area. This plan does not meet the specificity of commercial uses. She feels there are a lot of unanswered questions and the public need more certainty. There is no phasing in this plan and the plan specifies they could rezone this area immediately; this raises question as to what could be developed along the Highway 93 commercial corridor. She spoke about a transfer-of-right development. She urged the Board to table this plan until the new Growth Policy is adopted. The applicants had the opportunity to wait until after the new Growth Policy is adopted, and she would like broader public participation for this proposal as the public deserves that chance.

Marie AuClaire, 1203 Helena Flats Road, believes this project is in for the long-term; it won't be developed overnight. She is in favor of this proposal.

Vonnie Koenig, 430 Church Drive, feels that now is the time and respectfully asks the Board to approve this proposal.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

Ken Kalvig addressed the concerns of some of the speakers and reminded the Board this is a County Board, not a City Board. The city can be a part of the process, as demonstrated in the past, but it is still within the County jurisdiction. He said the people want detail in the planning and he feels it was covered on both sides of the issue; he is all for it. He would like to have one public hearing for planning, zoning and subdivision all at once and not three separate processes. He stated he could delay until the Growth Policy is adopted, but feels that may not happen as it has been postponed in the past. He stated the legislature already extended the date for the Growth Policy to be done. They submitted this application 6/28/05, did not want to have to wait this long, and do not want to wait any longer with the expectation that in a few months there will be a new Growth Policy. Nobody can promise that will be in place. This is simply a plan, not a zoning request or a subdivision request. There are many more processes to go through before it is accepted. Zoning and subdivision criteria have to be met or it can, and will, be denied. This is not the largest development in Flathead County; there are 47,000 acres in the West Valley Neighborhood Plan. He stated this application is minimal compared to that plan.

John Schwarz spoke about the density. The goal tonight is to provide planning. He stated the landfill will be dealt with in the subdivision process. The detail and annexation is a subdivision issue. He feels this is a suitable place for this plan. He also stated this is not a subdivision; this is planning at its best.

MOTION

Cross made a motion seconded by Fleming to table Staff Report FPMA 05-07 for a minimum of sixty (60) days to allow for additional public hearings and meetings with the developers.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Dziza asked Staff to explain what the process would be if this plan were approved.

Harris said if this plan were approved, it would become an amendment to the 1987 Master Plan. The Plan is not a regulatory document, it is a guidance document. It provides direction and information to make informed land use decisions. It also provides the template for zoning. If this is approved, the property owners would have to come before the Board to have zoning changes approved; those changes would have to fit the neighborhood plan. The parcels do not have to be rezoned; the zoning that is in place today would still remain in effect.

Dziza asked if any subdivision can be rejected if this plan were approved.

Harris stated this plan has its own unique land use category definitions.

Cross asked about the existing zoning on the lots and could the landowners still

develop their land even if this plan were not approved.

Harris explained what the landowners would be able to do. There are two conditions that would apply. The first is a land use category and a zoning district, which is larger than the property. In that case that is what you get. The other example is, you have a parcel, which is larger than the zoning and you can split it out to meet the density requirements within that zoning.

Cross asked about open space and conservation easements.

Harris spoke about the Conservation Easement and explained what the property owners could do. He also explained appropriate use of open space and stated Staff is concerned about keeping the open spaces public.

Hines stated this is a difficult process. He feels the Board owes the applicant a definite answer. However, he would like more opportunity for the public to express their concerns.

Lapp stated the adoption of the Master Plan marks only the beginning of the planning process; there will be zoning and subdivision after that. The development of a Master Plan is an ongoing process; the plan is outdated and we need to review it more often. He feels this is a good plan, and thinks the city is trying to annex this area.

Robertson doesn't feel it's fair to accuse the Board of stalling; she would like to have more time to review it. She likes the plan but is concerned about the commercial area. The view sheds are important in the valley and putting commercial along the highway is not protecting the view shed. She feels the local people should have more time to participate.

Dziza commented he has a lot of confidence in the planning staff and they have spent months going over this plan with the applicants. If action tonight complies with legal mandates, he is in favor of tabling the proposal.

Toavs feels this is a plan not a subdivision. Even though it is a large neighborhood he feels the Board should go forward.

Cross feels this is not consistent with the Master Plan. He feels there is an awful lot of language in the 1987 Master Plan to preserve agricultural land. He doesn't feel it is consistent with West Valley either. This plan doesn't search for innovative ways to preserve agricultural land. He thinks there are some problems with the plan and it needs refining. He would like to see the new Growth Policy and use that document as criteria for this plan. The landowners have done what was asked, yet we are within months of the new Growth Policy and they would have to come back with this plan again to make sure it is in compliance; he feels the timing is bad. He would like more public participation and get this project more inline with the new Growth Policy. He would be more inclined to support it then.

Fleming stated this project is zoned. Any one of these people could come in and ask to be rezoned. She is a big fan of zoning. She feels someone asked for this to be zoned this way and she thinks it is a shame to put a different plan over the top of this. She is

not convinced we need 3000 more houses. There are many reasons why several proposals for Two Rivers have already been turned down; including lack of infrastructure and public services. She expressed concern for the time element it takes to get traffic lights, public services, etc. to any area. She also has a concern with nearness to the landfill. She commented the jobs will come to an end at some point and we will end up with houses and pavement all around us. Cost of services such as grocery stores, police, and school buses is also a concern. We should not have to expend County resources to service these areas. She would see no problems with tabling this proposal.

ROLL CALL

On a roll call vote the motion passed 4-3 in favor with Lapp, Toavs, and Dziza dissenting.

**PRELIMINARY
PLAT/
WILKE
ESTATES**

A request by George Wilke for Preliminary Plat approval of Wilke Estates, a two (2) lot major subdivision on 7.09 acres. Both lots in the subdivision are proposed to have individual water and septic systems. The property is located at 200 Evers Creek Road.

STAFF REPORT

Kirsten Holland reviewed Staff Report FPP 05-82 for the Board.

APPLICANT

Nate Wyatt of Flathead Geomatics represented the applicant. He spoke about the water and septic layout. He also spoke about Subdivision #134 being adjacent to this proposal and having covenants associated with it.

AGENCIES

None present

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Andy Belski, of Flathead Geomatics, spoke in favor of this proposal and reiterated the fact this is not subject to the covenants for Subdivision #134. This property was never a part of that subdivision and is therefore not bound by the covenants. He commented about the remainder and stated the applicant has no plans to further divide the property.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None.

**MAIN
MOTION**

Larsen made a motion, seconded by Fleming to adopt Staff Report FPP 05-82 as findings of fact and recommended approval to the County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Holland wanted to clarify for the Board the parkland dedication calculation.

Lapp explained that you find the value of the entire undeveloped parcel and then take 5% of that for parkland dedication.

**MOTION
(Parkland
Dedication)**

Robertson made a motion seconded by Cross to change the parkland dedication language in the findings of fact.

ROLL CALL	On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.
MOTION (Add Condition)	Robertson made a motion seconded by Fleming to add a condition to place a statement on the face of the final plat indicating the 7.09 acre subject parcel shall not be subdivided.
ROLL CALL	On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.
MAIN MOTION ROLL CALL	On a roll call vote the motion passed 7-1 in favor with Hines dissenting.
PRELIMINARY PLAT/ HIDDEN WATERS	A request by Hidden Waters, LLP for Preliminary Plat approval of Hidden Water Subdivision, a 7-lot single-family residential subdivision on 37 acres. All lots in the subdivision are proposed to have individual water and septic systems. The property is located at 2220 US Highway 2 West.
STAFF REPORT	Kirsten Holland reviewed Staff Report FPP 05-85 for the Board.
APPLICANT	<p>Rick Breckenridge, of Montana Mapping Associates, represented the applicant. He stated there is an existing house on the property. The owner of the home did some mining to open up a pond. The applicants felt there needed to be more information brought forward for this proposal due to that. The property is zoned R-1, and they are doing 5 ½ acre densities with on-site septic systems. He spoke about the existing well and stated it is not part of the Smith Valley controlled ground water. He commented his staff is including the nitrate levels in the overall area of all of his applications. He stated the applicant will pave the internal subdivision road.</p> <p>Matt Daniels, of Flathead Geomatics, evaluated the floodplain impacts for this development as required by the Planning Department.</p> <p><u>Michael Blend</u>, West Bluegrass, spoke about development and thinks this is a nice development. He said they would be redoing the entire site and cleaning it up.</p>
AGENCIES	None present.
PUBLIC COMMENT	None.
STAFF REBUTTAL	None.
APPLICANT REBUTTAL	None.
MAIN MOTION	Fleming made a motion seconded by Robertson to adopt staff report FPP-05-85 and recommended approval to the Board of County Commissioners.
MOTION (Add Condition)	Hines made a motion seconded by Robertson to add a condition to include a community water system.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed adding a condition to add a community water system to this development. Breckenridge offered clarification for the Board. He referenced the information in the packet he handed out with the nitrate levels in this area which was taken from all the information the Health Department keeps as public record. He stated this project is in a semi-contained aquifer, and therefore the requirements and the situation is substantially different as they go from unconfined, confined, to semi-confined aquifers. The issue regarding a public water system is not necessary.

ROLL CALL

On a roll call vote the motion failed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
ROLL CALL**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

The Board addressed the issue of sending the DEQ information to the Board in their packets, as well as any and all information submitted by the applicant.

Holland offered her views on what should be sent although she said we should be consistent.

Larsen mentioned he called and thanked the gentlemen that spoke at the retreat. The speakers wanted to make sure the Board thought it was worth their time. The Board unanimously agreed they did a great job. They also said if Staff has any questions they should please call.

Harris thanked the Board for sitting through the public hearing for Riverdale Master Plan Amendment this evening; he thought it was very professional and well done. He said any feedback from the retreat would be appreciated and if the Board has any thoughts, Staff would like to hold these retreats periodically. They discussed having these twice a year.

**NEW
BUSINESS/
PUBLIC
COMMENT**

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:30 p.m. on a motion by Robertson seconded by Fleming. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on March 15, 2006.

Jeff Larsen, President

Mary Sevier, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED/CORRECTED: 4/12/06